

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of the instant amendment, claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to more clearly and particularly point out the scope of the invention.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims as previously and presently amended certainly did and do contain subject matter that is disclosed in the specification. Absolutely no new matter was added.

Reading through the Examiner's rejection, it is clear that there is some confusion on the Examiner's part relating to the nature of Applicant's invention. In particular, on page 2, par. 3, line 6, the Examiner states, "The specification does not disclose that the current blocking device, the hum eliminator, is electrically isolated from any power source." Clearly the Examiner is equating the current blocking device with the entire invention or system--the hum eliminator. In fact, however, upon more than a casual reading of the claim, it can be clearly seen that the current blocking device is simply an electrical component that is part of the hum eliminator invention—it is not the hum eliminator itself.

Therefore, it is absolutely true that the hum eliminator itself is not electrically isolated from any power sources. Furthermore, it is equally true that the current blocking device is electrically isolated from any type of power source. Put another way, the hum eliminator is physically connected or plugged into to a power source having live and neutral wires, but the current blocking device (or noise detection circuitry) on the ground wire is isolated from the power source.

In addition, in the interest of extreme clarity and to remove any doubt, Applicant has further amended the claims to make it crystal clear that the current blocking device is not connected to the live and neutral wires of an electrical source. Support for the claim amendment can be found on page 5, lines 7-16. Also, figure 2 makes it abundantly clear that the ground line along with the current blocking device is not in electrical contact with the live and neutral lines. Further, Applicants once again reiterate their arguments presented in their Office Action response filed on March 30, 2007.

Appl. No. 10/602,808 .  
Amdt. dated August 4, 2004  
Reply to Office action of July 3, 2007

In light of the above, and in consideration of the Examiner's error in properly reading and interpreting the claim, Applicants feel that it is only equitable that the Examiner withdraw the notice of final rejection. Also, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By \_\_\_\_\_

Romi N. Bose  
Reg. No. 43,322  
Tel: (630) 355-5144